Kevin: Realworldfare (formerly Kevin: Walker)

Care of: 30650 Rancho California Road #406-251

Temecula, California [92591]

non-domestic without the United States
Email: team@walkernovagroup.com

Plaintiff, Real Party In Interest, Secured Party, Injured Party



# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Kevin: Walker,

Plaintiff/Real Party In Interest,

v

Chad Bianco, Steven Arthur Sherman, Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, Robert Gell, Nicholas Gruwell, Joseph Sinz, Michael Hestrin, Miranda

14 | Thomson,

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF, THE

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF

CALIFORNIA, SOUTHWEST JUSTICE CENTER, FERGUSON PRAET &

SHERMAN A PROFESSIONAL

**CORPORATION,** Does 1-100 Inclusive Defendant(s).

19

20

21

22

27

28

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

Case No. 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA

VERIFIED NOTICE OF JUDICIAL
DEFAULT AND DISHONOR ON
PENDING MOTION, DENIAL OF DUE
PROCESS, ULTRA VIRES
OBSTRUCTION, AND DEMAND FOR
EQUITABLE RELIEF NUNC PRO TUNC
AND DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE
RULING

(SPECIAL LIMITED APPEARANCE — IN EQUITY ONLY — EQUITY JURISDICTION PRESERVED)

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

This matter is brought in **equity**, under the original and exclusive jurisdiction of this Court

as authorized by **Article III, Section 2** of the Constitution of the United States. All statutory

23 | jurisdiction is expressly denied and rebutted. This is a Court of Record. All rights are

24 reserved without prejudice pursuant to UCC 1-308.

25 COMES NOW Kevin: Realworldfare (formerly Kevin: Walker), a natural, freeborn, living

26 man on the land and soil of the *De'Jure* Republic, one of the people of the <u>u</u>nited <u>states</u> of

America, and the Real Party in Interest, Respondent, and Injured Party in this matter.

Kevin proceeds sui juris, by specially limited appearing only in proper private capacity,

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Date: August 14, 2025

not as a 14th Amendment "U.S. citizen," not as a corporate "person," not pro se, not pro per, not as a "resident," and **not** through any fictitious legal construct — but as **one of the** people, the Plaintiff, Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, and Creditor, standing on the land and soil jurisdiction of the **De Jure Republic**, without adhesion, contract, or submission to any foreign corporate entity posing as government. Real Party In Interest invokes invokers this Court's original jurisdiction in equity, as vested under Article III of the Constitution for the United States of America and demands adjudication according to the facts, truth, common law, the Bill of Rights, and applicable constitutional guarantees.

## I. NOTICE OF EQUITABLE STANDING AND LACK OF ADEQUATE REMEDY

- 1. Equity intervenes where the law fails. Where there is no adequate remedy at law, equity is not only appropriate but required. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the continued and compounding violations of fundamental rights, including liberty, property, due process, and freedom from unlawful seizure and retaliation.
- The Bill of Rights—specifically the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth **Amendments**—stands as **supreme law** restraining all branches of government. No statutory scheme or "local rule" can diminish these guarantees.
- This Court, sitting in equity and as a Court of Record, is **bound** to uphold these rights. Delay or refusal to adjudicate an emergency equitable verified motion and demand amounts to judicial bad faith and denial of due process.

### II. JUDICIAL DEFAULT ON PENDING MOTION

- 1. On June 18, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Renewed Verified Motion and Demand to Vacate Prior Denial of Injunctive Relief under FRCP 60(b)(1) and (b)(6). Said motion explicitly and comprehensively satisfied the Winter v. NRDC, 555 U.S. 7 (2008) factors, with sworn affidavits, unrebutted evidence, and constitutional authority establishing entitlement to equitable relief.
- The <u>verified</u> motion and demand has been on the docket for weeks, properly filed and served, yet this Court has **refused to rule**. No lawful opposition or rebuttal has been

entered by any Defendant. This silence constitutes not judicial restraint, but **judicial** 1 obstruction and gross dereliction of duty. 2 3 3. Equity admits of no delay where irreparable harm is shown. "Justice delayed is justice denied." The Court's failure to adjudicate a verified emergency motion is the 4 functional equivalent of denial without hearing, in direct violation of FRCP 65, 5 Article III, Section 2, and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. 6 7 4. In equity, "Equity regards that as done which ought to have been done." By failing 8 to act on a motion that fully satisfies the governing standard, this Court stands in judicial 9 **default**. Such default is not procedural—it is **jurisdictional forfeiture**. A court that refuses to rule when law and equity require action ceases to sit in law and equity and 10 instead commits fraud upon the court. 11 This Court's silence while irreparable harm continues unabated is **proof of bias**, 12 13 complicity, and abdication of judicial responsibility. It renders prior orders void ab initio and exposes the Court to mandamus, disqualification, and accountability under 14 15 both 28 U.S.C. §§ 455, 351–364 and the Bill of Rights. 6. Accordingly, judicial default has attached. The pending verified motion and demand 16 must be deemed granted by default in equity nunc pro tunc to the date of filing, and 17 all relief therein demanded is enforceable as if entered by order of this Court. 18 19 III. BILL OF RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN CONTINUING DEFAULT 1. First Amendment – Right to Petition for Redress 20 21 Plaintiff has exercised the sacred right to petition this Court for redress of grievances. Instead of adjudicating, the Court has met lawful petition with retaliatory silence and 22 23 tacit endorsement of defendants' unlawful acts. This is not neutrality. This is **complicity**. By refusing to rule, the Court becomes an accessory to the very retaliation complained 24 of, chilling free speech and denying the People the right to petition their government 25

2. Fourth Amendment – Security of Person and Property

without fear of reprisal.

26

27

28

Plaintiff continues to be deprived of the security of his person, property, and effects

Page 3 of 13

through unlawful arrests, seizures, and harassment carried out under color of law. The Court's refusal to rule while such violations persist is **judicial ratification of unlawful searches and seizures**. Such dereliction reduces this tribunal to nothing more than an enabler of tyranny, abandoning the constitutional guarantee that "the right of the people to be secure" shall not be violated.

#### 3. Fifth Amendment – Due Process of Law

Due process is **destroyed** when a Court refuses to rule on a verified, fully supported motion that is properly before it. Judicial silence in the face of constitutional claims and unrebutted affidavits is not mere neglect—it is **theft of process**, **denial of law**, and **fraud upon the court**. This Court, by standing mute, strips Plaintiff of life, liberty, and property without due process, in open rebellion against the Bill of Rights it is sworn to uphold.

#### 4. Seventh Amendment – Trial by Jury

The Seventh Amendment secures the right to trial by jury in civil controversies exceeding twenty dollars. By obstructing Plaintiff's path to adjudication and refusing to allow this controversy to proceed, this Court effectively **nullifies the Seventh Amendment**. Judicial inaction has the same effect as denial by decree: it blocks access to a jury of peers, depriving the People of their historic shield against judicial and governmental abuse.

### 5. Fourteenth Amendment – Equal Protection of the Laws

This Court has applied rules and procedures with one hand to suppress Plaintiff's filings while turning the other hand to indulge defendants' silence and default. This is not impartiality—it is **two-tiered justice**, the very essence of unequal protection. Where the Court punishes the injured party while shielding the violators, the guarantee of equal protection collapses. Such selective enforcement is **arbitrary**, **discriminatory**, **and unconstitutional on its face**.

#### IV. EQUITABLE CONSEQUENCES OF DEFAULT

1. The **failure of this Court to rule** on a verified emergency motion, while irreparable harm compounds daily, is not a neutral omission—it is **judicial obstruction**, willful Page 4 of 13

Date: August 14, 2025

misconduct, and fraud upon the court. Such refusal to act is the very essence of tyranny cloaked in robes, and it obliterates any claim this tribunal has to lawful authority.
Equity suffers no wrong without a remedy. Silence in the face of verified affidavits and unrebutted motions is not caution—it is confession. In equity and in commerce, silence is acquiescence, and unrebutted affidavits stand as truth. By operation of law,

every factual assertion and demand set forth in Plaintiff's filings is admitted.

- 3. Judicial default is not merely procedural; it is **jurisdictional forfeiture**. A court that refuses to rule on an emergency equitable motion ceases to function as a court of law or equity, and instead descends into a forum of corruption and dishonor. **This Court, by its silence, has confessed its bias, surrendered its legitimacy, and abandoned its oath.**
- 4. Accordingly, judicial default operates as **tacit admission** of the relief sought. The pending Temporary Restraining Order is not "awaiting adjudication"—it is **self-executing in equity**, and by default must be deemed **granted nunc pro tunc** to the date of filing. The relief demanded is already lawfully vested, and this Court's inaction cannot strip the Plaintiff of rights secured under the Constitution and the common law.
- 5. In plain terms: the Court has defaulted, the record stands unrebutted, and equity compels judgment in Plaintiff's favor, with all requested relief enforceable forthwith.

#### **V. CONCLUSION**

This Court's continued refusal to rule on Plaintiff's verified emergency motion is not an oversight—it is **deliberate obstruction**, **willful dereliction of duty**, **and treason against the Constitution it is sworn to uphold.** A judge who sits silent while irreparable harm multiplies is not exercising discretion, but engaging in **fraud upon the court** and open defiance of Article III, the Bill of Rights, and the very principles of due process and equal protection.

- In equity, **silence is confession**. By failing to rebut Plaintiff's verified affidavits and motions, this Court has admitted every material fact and every demand for relief.
- Jurisdictional legitimacy has been forfeited. Judicial default has attached. The pending TRO Page 5 of 13

	Date: August 14, 2025
1	is <b>deemed granted nunc pro tunc</b> to the date of filing, and all requested relief is lawfully
2	vested in the Plaintiff as a matter of right.
3	Let the record forever reflect: this Court, by its silence, has placed itself in dishonor,
4	confessed bias, and revealed its complicity in ongoing constitutional violations. Equity
5	and common law do not tolerate such betrayal. The People do not tolerate such betrayal.
6	Plaintiff stands on the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the maxims of equity, and
7	demands judgment now.
8	Justice delayed is justice denied. Justice denied is no justice at all. This Court is in
9	default.
10	<u>VI. EQUITABLE DEMAND</u>
11	1. In equity, when the law fails and rights are threatened with irreparable injury, the
12	Court has absolutely no discretion to withhold relief. Equity is not permissive—it
13	is mandatory where justice demands intervention. The controlling maxim is
14	eternal: "Equity will not suffer a wrong without a remedy." Plaintiff has
15	demonstrated the wrongs, proven irreparable harm with specificity, and entered
16	verified affidavits that remain unrebutted and therefore stand as truth in law and
17	commerce. No lawful opposition exists, no factual dispute remains, and no
18	statutory pretext can override constitutional guarantees. The absence of remedy in
19	such a posture is not delay—it is outright denial of justice. Equity compels the
20	remedy now, and the Court's only lawful function is to enter it.
21	2. Accordingly, Plaintiff <b>demands</b> that this Court immediately enter judgment and relief

consistent with the pending Verified Motion, including but not limited to:

2

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- The issuance of the Temporary Restraining Order and injunctive relief as prayed for, deemed granted nunc pro tunc to the date of filing.
- Formal recognition on the record that Defendants, having failed to rebut verified affidavits, stand in tacit confession and default.
- A declaration that continued silence or refusal to rule will be treated as fraud, bias, obstruction, and forfeiture of jurisdiction.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 3. Plaintiff further places this Court on notice that **failure to comply with this equitable demand will trigger immediate remedies outside this tribunal**, including but not limited to:
  - o Mandatory disqualification of the presiding judge under 28 U.S.C. § 455.
  - Petition for Writ of Mandamus in the Ninth Circuit to compel adjudication and vacate void orders.
  - Judicial misconduct complaints under 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364 for obstruction and violation of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges.
  - o Invocation of the **People's reserved rights** under the Bill of Rights, common law, and equity to enforce judgment independently when the court abdicates its duty.
  - 4. In equity, once default has attached, relief is not a matter of judicial grace—it is a matter of right. This Court has already confessed default by silence; Plaintiff now demands enforcement of that default without further delay.

#### VII. RESERVATION OF ARTICLE III ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

- 1. Without conceding jurisdiction in this inferior tribunal, Plaintiff places on record that Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution for the United States of America vests the Supreme Court of the United States with original jurisdiction "in all Cases ... in which a State shall be Party."
- 2. Plaintiff has named as Defendants "The People of the State of California," the RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF (an arm of the State), and the SOUTHWEST JUSTICE CENTER (a judicial arm of the State), thereby bringing a sovereign State into controversy. This fact alone triggers the Supreme Court's constitutional jurisdiction in original, not appellate, capacity.
- **3.** Any attempt by this District Court to continue sitting in judgment while ignoring that jurisdictional mandate constitutes **ultra vires usurpation**, is beyond statutory or constitutional delegation, and renders all further orders void ab initio. An inferior tribunal cannot lawfully seize powers reserved exclusively to the Supreme Court.

	Date: August 14, 2025
1	<b>4.</b> Plaintiff proceeds here in equity only, reserving all rights and remedies, and asserts that
2	if this Court persists in refusal to adjudicate, Plaintiff will pursue immediate remedies,
3	including mandamus and certification for transfer to the Supreme Court under
4	Article III, Section 2.
5	5. Accordingly, Plaintiff demands that this Court either (a) acknowledge its want of
6	jurisdiction and certify transfer to the Supreme Court of the United States, or (b)
7	immediately rule on the pending Verified Motion in equity. Failure to do either shal
8	stand as conclusive evidence of bias, obstruction, and dishonor.
9	VIII. NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL; NOTICE TO PRINCIPA
10	<u>IS NOTICE TO AGENT</u>
11	1. It is a controlling maxim in law, equity, and commerce that notice to an agent is
12	notice to the principal, and notice to the principal is notice to the agent. See
13	Bank of United States v. Dandridge, 25 U.S. (12 Wheat.) 64, 70 (1827); Farr v.
14	Newman, 14 N.Y.2d 183, 187 (1964). This doctrine binds all parties up and dowr
15	the chain of agency, preventing evasion, willful blindness, or compartmentalized
16	denial of knowledge.
17	2. The following named Defendants, their agents, counsel, representatives, and assigns, and
18	all intertwined and inseparably bound by this notice:
19	• Chad Bianco, Steven Arthur Sherman, Gregory D. Eastwood, Robert C.V.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Chad Bianco, Steven Arthur Sherman, Gregory D. Eastwood, Robert C.V. Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, Robert Gell, Nicholas Gruwell, Joseph Sinz, Michael Hestrin, Miranda Thomson, RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHWEST JUSTICE CENTER, FERGUSON PRAET & SHERMAN, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION, and DOES 1-100 Inclusive.
- Service of this Verified Notice upon any one of the above Defendants, their counsel, or their authorized representatives constitutes lawful and binding service upon them all. Each Defendant is imputed with full knowledge of this Notice, and each Defendant's silence shall be taken as acquiescence and confession.

Case 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Document 49 Filed 08/17/25 Page 9 of 13 Page ID Date: August 14, 2025 4. Likewise, service upon counsel of record—Ferguson Praet & Sherman, A 1 2 **Professional Corporation**—is binding service upon all individual defendants they represent, and upon the government entities and offices intertwined with them. Counsel 3 cannot shield Defendants from liability, nor can Defendants disclaim the knowledge of 4 5 their attorneys. 5. No Defendant, counsel, or affiliated entity may later claim ignorance, lack of notice, 6 7 or separation from the others. All are joined in privity, all are agents and principals to 8 one another, and all are bound in solidum. Notice in this matter has been perfected. 9 Silence by any is silence by all. Acquiescence by any is acquiescence by all. The entire 10 body of Defendants is now in judicial and commercial default. 11 12 13 14 15 **VERIFICATION:** 16 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 17 I. Kevin: Realworldfare, over the age of 18, competent to testify, and having firsthand knowledge 18 of the facts stated herein, do hereby declare, certify, verify, affirm, and state under penalty of 19 periury under the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing statements are true. 20 correct, and complete, to the best of my understanding, knowledge, and belief, and made in 21 good faith. 22 Executed, signed, and sealed this 14th day of August in the year of Our Lord two thousand and 23 twenty five, without the United States. 24 All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, UCC § 1-308, 3-402. 25 26 27

Kevin: Realworldfare, Real Party In Interest, Plaintiff, Secured Party, Injured Party

Page 9 of 13

28

## LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE: 1 1. Exhibit A: Affidavit: Power of Attorney In Fact' 2.Exhibit B: Hold Harmless Agreement 3 3. Exhibit C: Private UCC Contract Trust/UCC1 filing #2024385925-4. 4. Exhibit D: Private UCC Contract Trust/UCC3 filing ##2024402990-2. 5. E Exhibit E: Contract Security Agreement #RF775820621US, titled: NOTICE OF 6 CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING, 7 CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, 8 IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON. 9 6. Exhibit F: Contract Security Agreement #RF775821088US, titled: NOTICE OF 10 DEFAULT, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF 11 RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, 12 COERCION, TREASON 13 7. Exhibit G: Contract Security Agreement #RF775822582US, titled: NOTICE OF 14 DEFAULT AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE AND NOTICE OF FRAUD, 15 RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE 16 COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, 17 KIDNAPPING. 18 8. Exhibit H: Contract Security Agreement #RF775823645US, titled: Affidavit 19 Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN 20 21 AUTHORIZATION. 9. **Exhibit I**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit E. 10. Exhibit J: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit F. 23 11. **Exhibit K**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit G. 24 12. Exhibit L: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit H. 25 13. Exhibit M: INVOICE/TRUE BILL #RIVSHERTREAS12312024 26 14. Exhibit N: Copy of 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY BOND' 27

28

#RF661448567US.

Case 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Document 49 Filed 08/17/25 Page 11 of 13 Page ID Date: August 14, 2025 15.**Exhibit O**: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Gregory D Eastwood. 16. **Exhibit P**: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Robert C V Bowman. 3 17. **Exhibit Q**: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Willam Pratt. 18. Exhibit R: Affidavit 'Right to Travel': CANCELLATION, TERMINATION, AND 4 REVOCATION of COMMERCIAL "For Hire" DRIVER'S LICENSE CONTRACT 5 and AGREEMENT. LICENSE/BOND # B6735991 6 19. **Exhibit S:** Revocation Termination and Cancelation of Franchise. 8 20. Exhibit T: CITATION/BOND #TE464702, accepted under threat, duress, and coercion. 9 21. Exhibit U: Private Transport's PRIVATE PLATE displayed on the automobile 10 22. Exhibit V: Copy of "Automobile" and "commercial vehicle" defined by DMV 11 12 (Department of Motor Vehicles). 13 23. **Exhibit W**: Copy of CA CODE § 260 from <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov</a>. 24. Exhibit X: national/non-citizen national passport card #C35510079. 14 25. Exhibit Y: national/non-citizen national passport book #A39235161. 15 26.**Exhibit Z**: ™KEVIN LEWIS WALKER© Copyright and Trademark Agreement. 16 27. Exhibit AA: A copy of American Bar Association's 'Attorney In Fact' Definition. 17 18 28. Exhibit BB: A Copy of Rule 8.4: (Misconduct) of the American Bar Association. 29. **Exhibit CC:** Twenty-six 3811 forms showing Defendants' acceptance of service 19 of all documents via USPS and electronic service, including SUMMONS and 20 COMPLAINT. 21 22 23 //24

Page 11 of 13

25

26

27

28

//

#### OFPROOF SERVICE 1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 2 3 SS. COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE 4 I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within 5 action. My mailing address is the Walkernova Group, care of: 30650 Rancho 6 California Road suite #406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or about August 8 17, 2025, I served the within documents: **VERIFIED NOTICE OF JUDICIAL DEFAULT AND DISHONOR ON** 9 1. PENDING MOTION, DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS, ULTRA VIRES 10 OBSTRUCTION, AND DEMAND FOR EQUITABLE RELIEF NUNC PRO 11 TUNC AND DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE RULING 12 13 **By Electronic Service.** Based on a contract, and/or court order, and/or an 14 agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the 15 documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed below. Steven-Arthur: Sherman 16 C/o STEVEN ARTHUR SHERMAN, FERGUSON PRAET & SHERMAN A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 17 1631 East 18th Street Santa Ana, California [92705-7101] 18 ssherman@law4cops.com csherman@law4cops.com 19 20 Chad: Bianco, Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, Robert Gell, Joseph Sinz, Nicholas Gruwell, 21 C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF 4095 Lemon Street, 2nd Floor Riverside, California [92501] 22 ssherman@law4cops.com 23 csherman@law4cops.com rsoscscentral@riversidesheriff.org 24 isinz@riversidesheriff.org wpratt@riversidesheriff.org 25 26 Miranda Thomson, Michael Hestrin C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, THE PEOPLE OF 27 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, SOUTHWEST 28 JUSTICE CENTER Page 12 of 13

Case 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Document 49 Filed 08/17/25 Page 13 of 13 Page ID #:1765 Date: August 14, 2025 3960 Orange Street Riverside, California [92501] DAOffice@rivco.org Rob Bonta C/o PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 3960 Orange Street Riverside, California [92501] piu@doj.ca.gov Police-Practices@doj.ca.gov I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on August 17, 2025 in Riverside County, California. /s/Chris Yarbra/ Chris Yarbra Page 13 of 13